

Deconfinement phase transition in mirror of symmetries

M.N. Chernodub,^{1,2,3} Atsushi Nakamura,⁴ and V.I.Zakharov^{3,5}

¹*Laboratoire de Mathématiques et Physique Théorique, CNRS UMR 6083, Fédération Denis Poisson, Université de Tours, Parc de Grandmont, F37200, Tours, France*

²*Department of Mathematical Physics and Astronomy, University of Gent, Krijgslaan 281, S9, B-9000 Gent, Belgium*

³*Institute for Theoretical and Experimental Physics, B. Cheremushkinskaya 25, Moscow, 117218, Russia*

⁴*Research Institute for Information Science and Education, Hiroshima University, Higashi-Hiroshima, 739-8527, Japan*

⁵*Max-Planck-Institut für Physik, Föhringer Ring 6, 80805 München, Germany*
(Dated: April 06, 2009)

We summarize and extend evidence that the deconfinement phase transition in Yang-Mills theories can be viewed as change of effective non-perturbative degrees of freedom and of symmetries of their interactions. In short, the strings in four dimensions (4d) at temperatures below the critical temperature T_c are replaced by particles, or field theories in 3d at $T > T_c$. The picture emerges within various approaches based, in particular, on dual models, lattice data and field theoretic models. We concentrate mostly on the lattice data, or on the language of quantum geometry.

PACS numbers: 12.38.Aw, 25.75.Nq, 11.15.Tk

I. INTRODUCTORY REMARKS

Non-perturbative phenomena in Yang-Mills theories attract attention of theorists since long. The most famous problem is the confinement of color. More recently, observation of the 'strongly interacting quark-gluon plasma' (for review see, e.g. [1]) fueled the fascination.

Quasiclassical solutions seem to be most natural starting point to consider non-perturbative phenomena. And, indeed, instantons provide a clue to understand generically spontaneous chiral symmetry breaking. In contrast, there are no classical solutions of Yang-Mills equations which could be relevant to confinement.

String picture is best suited to approach the confinement. The deconfinement phase transition is then transition to percolation of strings [2]. In terms of the Yang-Mills fields the first stringy operator with well established relation to deconfinement is the Polyakov line,

$$L = P \exp \left\{ -i \int_0^{1/T} A_0 d\tau \right\}. \quad (1)$$

The vacuum expectation value of the Polyakov line is an order parameter for the confinement-deconfinement phase transition. Moreover, there are widely discussed models, see, e.g., [3, 4, 5] which assume that the Polyakov line becomes a dynamical variable with potential (in its simplest form):

$$V(\langle TrL \rangle) = c_2 \langle TrL \rangle^2 + c_4 \langle TrL \rangle^4, \quad (2)$$

so that the deconfining phase corresponds to the tachyonic sign of the coefficient c_2 .

Phenomenologically, confinement and chiral symmetry breaking are strongly correlated and it seems unsatisfactory to explain these phenomena within models which

are not related to each other. A framework to reach synthesis of instantons and, say, Polyakov's lines is provided by dual models, or gauge/string duality, for review see, e.g. [6]. Within these models all the non-perturbative effects of gauge theories are related to properties of strings and/or D-branes in extra dimensions.

The model [7] turned to be most successful to unify phenomenology of confinement and of chiral symmetry breaking. The geometry of the model introduces, in particular, a confinement-related horizon in an extra coordinate u and a compact coordinate x_4 :

$$ds^2 = \left(\frac{u}{R_0} \right)^{3/2} \left(-dt^2 + \delta_{ij} dx^i dx^j + f(u) dx_4^2 \right) + \left(\frac{u}{R_0} \right)^{-3/2} \left(\frac{du^2}{f(u)} + u^2 d\Omega_4^2 \right), \quad (3)$$

where

$$f(u) = 1 - \left(\frac{u}{u_\Lambda} \right)^3$$

and u_Λ is the position of the horizon, $d\Omega_4^2$ is the metric of a four-dimensional sphere; the corresponding coordinates will not play any crucial role in our considerations. At non-zero temperature, $T \neq 0$ there are two compact coordinates, x_4 and the Euclidean time τ . The deconfinement phase transition is the interchange of geometry in the coordinates x_4 and τ .

As is emphasized in [8] the geometrical picture outlined above reproduces main features of the phenomenology, such as condensation of magnetic degrees of freedom at $T = 0$ or Polyakov's lines becoming tensionless at $T = T_c$. Moreover, it predicts existence of the magnetic component of plasma which might be crucial to explain the unusual properties of the plasma [9, 10, 11, 12, 13]. Transition at $T = T_c$ from 4d strings to 3d field theories, mentioned in the abstract, is predicted as well.

Although the gauge/string duality suggests an exciting perspective of a unified description of the confinement and of strongly interacting plasma, this description is mostly qualitative at the moment. Indeed, conclusions mentioned above are based exclusively on consideration of topology of the extra dimensions (3). Exact metric (3) is a property of large N_c -approximation and can hardly be true in the realistic case. Also, theory predicts a strong first order phase transition while it is either second order in case of SU(2) gauge group or weak first order in case of SU(3).

Thus, the gauge/string duality considerations would remain pure speculations unless they can be complemented by other, more quantitative evidence. In this note we turn to the lattice evidence concerning the magnetic defects at $T \neq 0$ (for a review of the $T = 0$ case see [14]). The language used by the lattice is in fact the language of quantum geometry, see, e.g., [15]. The main result of the present paper is that the lattice data indeed demonstrate transition from strings living in 4d at $T < T_c$ to 3d field theories at $T > T_c$. Moreover, the lattice data allow to establish some particular features of the emerging 3d theories, such as Higgs condensation of a scalar field.

Another quantitative approach to the deconfinement is the use of effective theories. We already mentioned a prototype of such theories, see Eq (2). Nowadays there exist much more developed versions of course. In particular, quite a detailed comparison of the lattice-motivated models with the analytical model of Ref. [5] turns possible. In their gross features the models turn similar but there exist important differences as well.

II. THREE-DIMENSIONAL MAGNETIC HIGGS FIELD ON THE LATTICE

A. Percolation of 1d defects

Lattice data which we will analyze refers to 'defects' which are nothing else but (closed) lines and (closed) surfaces. Both the lines and surfaces are defined as infinitely thin. Historically, the defects were identified empirically as configurations responsible for confinement. The 1d defects are called magnetic monopoles while surfaces are center vortices, for review and further references see [16]. Originally, the defects were defined in specific lattice language of the so called projected fields. Later, they were identified in the language used by the continuum theory [14]. In particular, the surfaces are identified as magnetic vortices, or strings. By definition, the magnetic strings are closed surfaces in the (Euclidean) vacuum which can be open on an external 't Hooft line.

We will not go into all the details now and only emphasize that the language appropriate for the lattice data is that of the quantum geometry. As a simplest example of this type let us remind the reader that the percolation theory corresponds to a theory of free scalar field in

Euclidean space-time.

The percolation theory introduces the probability p of a link to be "occupied". A connected sequence of occupied links is called trajectory. The percolation theory is mapped into field theory by the relation

$$p \equiv -\ln(M \cdot a), \quad (4)$$

where M is the bare mass and a is the lattice spacing, $a \rightarrow 0$ in the continuum limit.

The mass gets renormalized and the physical mass of the bosonic field is related to the bare mass through the balance of action and entropy:

$$m_{\text{phys}}^2 = \frac{\text{const}}{a} \left[M(a) - \frac{\ln 7}{a} \right], \quad (5)$$

where the $\ln 7$ is specific for cubic lattice in 4d and we reserved for dependence of the bare mass $M(a)$ on the lattice spacing. Note that the physical mass m_{phys}^2 is independent on the lattice spacing a only if there is almost exact cancelation between the two terms in the right hand side of Eq. (5). This is the action-entropy balance.

At a critical value, p_c there appears an infinite cluster of trajectories. In our case $p_c = 1/7$. In the standard field-theory language this point corresponds to the physical mass (5) mass becoming tachyonic. The probability of a given link to belong to the infinite cluster is

$$\theta_{\text{perc}} \sim (p - p_c)^\alpha, \quad \alpha > 0. \quad (6)$$

Moreover the emergence of the infinite cluster signals the spontaneous symmetry breaking and

$$|\langle \phi \rangle|^2 \sim \theta_{\text{perc}}, \quad (7)$$

where ϕ is a Higgs field [17]. It is amusing that percolation produces the Higgs phenomenon without an explicit introduction of the Higgs potential. The interpretation of the lattice data at zero temperature on the magnetic monopoles in terms of the percolation theory can be found in [17].

B. Monopole percolation around T_c : evidence for strings

Percolating monopole trajectories fall on surfaces which are magnetic strings. Quantum geometry of surfaces (or strings) is less developed. Nevertheless, such concepts as action-entropy balance are well known as well. Moreover, the monopole trajectories are strongly correlated with the vortices and cover them densely. This observation allows us to use alternatively the languages of the 1d and 2d defects. In particular this trick (replacing the 2d defects by the 1d defects) was used in [9] to argue, on the basis of the percolation theory, that at $T > T_c$ the magnetic degrees of freedom become part of the thermal Yang-Mills plasma. Let us review briefly the argumentation and emphasize that in fact the lattice

data cannot be understood in terms of (effective) 4d field theory of monopoles. Instead, one should invoke strings which are non-local objects.

One begins again [as in case of (5)] with free field theory in Euclidean time but now at non-zero temperature, $T \neq 0$. One can then show that the so called wrapped trajectories which start at Euclidean time $\tau = 0$ and reach the other boundary $\tau = 1/T$ (and then “wrapped” back because of the periodic boundary condition) correspond to real (as opposed to virtual) particles. Intuitively, this is appealing since the wrapped trajectories visualize particles which ‘exist for ever’. In terms of equations [9]:

$$\rho(T) = n_{\text{wr}} , \quad (8)$$

where n_{wr} is the density of the wrapped trajectories and

$$\rho(T) \equiv \int \frac{d^3\mathbf{p}}{(2\pi)^3} \frac{1}{[\exp(\omega_{\mathbf{p}} + \mu)/T] - 1} ,$$

A crucial test of applicability of (8) to the lattice monopoles is provided by measuring how the density n_{wr} scales with the lattice spacing. It should be in physical units, independent of the lattice spacing. This, highly non-trivial constraint is indeed satisfied by the data [13].

So far, there is similarity between standard thermal particles and lattice monopoles. There exists, however, a crucial difference as well. The point is that for ordinary scalar particles the trajectories percolate uniformly in all four dimensions also at $T \neq 0$. This is a generic feature of a local field theory which does not depend, in particular, on the sign of m_{phys}^2 , see Eq. (5). The wrapped trajectories arise when a percolating trajectory is so to say ‘trapped’ by the periodic boundary condition and becomes a wrapped trajectory. Thus, the Boltzmann factor corresponds to the density of virtual particles at $T = 0$ which propagate distance $1/T$.

The behavior of the trajectories of the lattice monopoles around $T = T_c$ is very different. Namely, both in case of 1d and 2d defects one can introduce a *local* order parameter which quantifies the time alignment of the defects. In case of monopoles this quantity is [18]:

$$A = \frac{3\langle |n_t|^2 \rangle - \langle |\mathbf{n}|^2 \rangle}{3\langle |n_t|^2 \rangle + \langle |\mathbf{n}|^2 \rangle} , \quad (9)$$

where the temporal, $|n_t|$, and spatial, $|\mathbf{n}|$, currents take values 1,0 depending on the direction of the monopole trajectory (on the 4d cubic lattice). In Eq. (9) a statistical average over all monopole configurations is assumed.

In particular it was demonstrated in [19] that the asymmetry (9) measured on the trajectories can serve as an order parameter which equals zero in the confined phase and is positive in the deconfined phase. Let us emphasize again that the local asymmetry (9) at points inside the lattice volume can arise because the monopoles are in fact defects living on the surfaces, or strings. And the strings, in turn, are non-local and can “learn” about the time direction because the boundary condition in the time direction is singled out by its periodicity.

Similar asymmetry was observed directly for the magnetic vortices as well [20]. Moreover, the transition to almost complete time alignment is quite fast so that (numerically) the percolation picture for the vortices is completely changed in the temperature interval

$$0.8 T_c < T < 1.1 T_c .$$

At lower temperatures the percolation picture for the vortices is four dimensional while at the upper edge the percolation occurs in three spatial dimensions.

Thus, at $T > T_c$ the time dependence becomes (approximately) trivial and the vortices can be reduced to their 3d projections which are 1d trajectories percolating in a 3d time slice. Since the original vortices are closed the trajectories are closed as well.

C. Higgs-field condensate

Now we come to the central point of this section: at $T > T_c$ the continuum-theory description of the 2d dimensional surfaces simplifies greatly and can be given in terms of *3d field theory*. The reason is that the strings become time-oriented [20]. Their geometry in time direction becomes trivial and the strings can be characterized entirely in terms of their 3d projection. The 3d projections, or intersections of the 2d surfaces with a 3d volume of a time slice represent 1d defects, or trajectories. Finally, in quantum geometry, trajectories in any number of dimensions can be mapped to a field theory.

Thus, we are invited to interpret the lattice data on the magnetic defects in terms of a 3d field theory. In particular, it is crucial that the 1d trajectories considered do form an infinite cluster in a 3d time slice [20]. The total length of the percolating cluster can be defined in terms of the density ρ_s of the percolating vortices in the three-dimensional timeslice:

$$L_{\text{perc}} \equiv \rho_s V_{3d} \quad (10)$$

where V_{3d} is the total 3d volume of the time slice. The density ρ_s was measured and turned proportional to the tension of the spatial Wilson loop σ_s :

$$\rho_s \sim \sigma_s \sim T^2 g^4(T), \quad (11)$$

where $g^2(T)$ is the running coupling of the original 4d gauge theory, and the combination $g_3^2(T) = T g^2(T)$ corresponds to the 3d gauge coupling of the dimensionally reduced theory. The last relation in Eq. (11) is valid in the deconfined phase at temperatures larger than $2T_c$ [21]. The result (11) is non-trivial since there is no dependence on the lattice spacing, as it should be for physical fields and would not be true for the lattice “artifacts”.

Combining the observation (11) with Eq. (6) we come to the conclusion that there exists a 3d scalar field Σ_M condensed in the 3d vacuum:

$$\langle \Sigma_M \rangle \neq 0. \quad (12)$$

A reservation is that (12) assumes that the time orientation of the magnetic strings is complete and the 3d description is adequate. Near to $T = T_c$ this picture should be taken with caution since there are still “wiggles” of the surfaces in the time direction. In the 3d projection such wiggles would be manifested as breaking/disconnection of the infinite cluster. Instead of an infinite cluster one would observe rather a few ‘big’ clusters. With temperature going up such disconnections should occur more rarely.

D. Higgs-field quantum numbers

Thus, lattice provides a definite evidence in favor of a 3d magnetic Higgs field at $T > T_c$. Similar prediction arises in the dual models [8]. It is only on the lattice, however, that the prediction can be directly checked. There are limitations to the use of the lattice of course as well. In particular, one would like to learn more on interactions of the field Σ_M . The lattice data are limited, however to the magnetic degrees of freedom. Lattice is ‘blind’ (so far) to “electric degrees of freedom”, say, to the same Polyakov’s lines (see the Introduction). According to the string picture, non-vanishing vacuum expectation value of the Polyakov line, $\langle L \rangle \neq 0$ corresponds to 3d scalar particles in the adjoint representation, Π^a . Such particles are not visible directly on the lattice with the presently available techniques.

It is amusing that – despite of all these apparent limitations – we can still state that the Σ_M field has a negative parity (in case of the original SU(2) Yang-Mills theory). Indeed, introduce phenomenologically possible interaction terms:

$$L_{int} \sim s_3 \Sigma_M^3 + s_4 \Sigma_M^4 + s_5 \Sigma_M^5 + s_{1,2} \Sigma_M (\Pi^a)^2 + s_{2,2} \Sigma_M^2 (\Pi^a)^2 + \dots \quad (13)$$

Then it is known that terms with an odd number of Σ_M -legs is not allowed:

$$s_3 = s_5 = s_{1,2} = 0 \quad . \quad (14)$$

Indeed, the vertices corresponding to the interactions (13) would be seen on the lattice as intersections between the odd number of the corresponding trajectories¹. However, the trajectories of the magnetic strings are closed and the odd-number intersections are impossible.

In terms of the interactions (13) one can say that the Σ_M -field has a negative parity and the interaction Lagrangian is invariant under this parity transformation. We will return to this point later.

¹ Such intersections are observed for the monopole trajectories at $T=0$, see [17] and references therein.

E. Matching 3d theories of confinement

The 3d sector of Yang-Mills theories at high temperature is a confining theory in the sense that the spatial Wilson line obeys area law at all temperatures. Thus, we expect that if the emerging picture of the magnetic component in 3d is correct it should also produce understanding of this area law. The problem is currently under investigation [22]. The preliminary finding is that, indeed, the properties of the Σ_M -field do match models of the type [23].

F. What to measure next

One could get further information on the properties of the Σ_M field from lattice measurements.

An interesting quantity to measure is the non-Abelian action associated with the 1d defects. The action-entropy balance assumes that

$$(\text{Action})_{1d} \approx \frac{\ln 5}{a} L \quad , \quad (15)$$

where L is the length of trajectory. In case of four Euclidean dimensions the factor $\ln 5$ is replaced by $\ln 7$ and the latter relation was confirmed for the lattice monopoles at $T=0$ [24].

The mass of the excitations of the field Σ_M can be inferred from measuring distribution of finite cluster in length:

$$N(L) \sim \exp(-m_\Sigma^2 L a) \quad . \quad (16)$$

Furthermore, measuring extra action associated with self-intersections of the trajectories would allow to measure the coefficient s_4 , see Eq. (13).

III. THREE DIMENSIONAL MODELS WITH Z_2 PARITY

Now we will review briefly an independent approach to the theory of the deconfinement which started with effective theories for the Polyakov’s line [see (2)] and developed into superrenormalizable 3d field theories, see [3, 4, 5] and references therein. In particular we will compare the 3d theory of Ref. [5] with the models favored by the lattice data on the magnetic component, as discussed in the preceding section.

The model [5] postulates existence of a 3d color field Π^a and of a colorless field Σ_P with following potential energy:

$$V(\Sigma_P, \Pi_a) = b_1 \Sigma_P^2 + b_2 \Pi_a^2 + c_1 \Sigma_P^4 + c_2 (\Pi_a^2)^2 + c_3 \Sigma_P^2 \Pi_a^2 \quad (17)$$

While the field Π^a can be identified with the original field $A_0^a(\mathbf{x})$, the Σ_P -field is a new degree of freedom. The introduction of this new field turns to be crucial to correctly

reproduce the thermodynamics of the original 4d theory in terms of the effective 3d theory (17). It is amusing that numerically it is indeed possible to match the 3d theory to its original 4d counterpart beginning practically with $T \geq T_c$. At high temperature, one assumes that the new field Σ_P can be integrated out to reproduce the standard dimensionally reduced theory. To justify this procedure one assumes that the excitations of the Σ_P field are heavier (by an inverse power of the coupling $g(T)$) than excitations of the field Π^a .

Although potential (17) might look somewhat arbitrary it is motivated by remarkably simple symmetry considerations. One can say that the form (17) is the minimal realization of these symmetries possible. Indeed, the basic properties of (17) is that it is invariant under

$$\Sigma_P \rightarrow -\Sigma_P$$

and that $\langle \Sigma_P \rangle \neq 0$. To ensure these properties one needs nonvanishing coefficients b_1, c_1 . The $(\Pi^a)^2$ and $(\Pi^a)^4$ terms are standard for any dimensional reduction of the original Yang-Mills theory. Finally, the $\Sigma_P^2 (\Pi^a)^2$ interaction is needed for the Σ_P field not to be decoupled from the rest of the system.

The central point is that the invariance under the reflection $\Sigma_P \rightarrow -\Sigma_P$ and the fact that $\langle \Sigma_P \rangle \neq 0$ both corresponds the properties of the underlying 4d Yang-Mills theory. Namely, the Σ_P field represents the vacuum expectation value of the Polyakov line (and its fluctuations) at $T > T_c$. The parity transformation $\Sigma_P \rightarrow -\Sigma_P$ is then an analogue of the Z_2 transformation of the original Polyakov line.

IV. COMPARISON OF THE TWO APPROACHES

A. Thermodynamics of plasma

The magnetic component on the lattice appears to be crucial for thermodynamics of the whole plasma at temperatures about $T_c \leq T \leq 3T_c$. This follows from measurements of the contribution of the 4d vortices into the equation of state of the Yang-Mills plasma [11]. In the language of the 3d models a qualitatively similar conclusion was made in Ref. [5], this time about the role of the newly introduced Higgs field Σ_P .

It is amusing that both the field Σ_P and the magnetic component in the 4d language are tachyonic. In case of the vortices the contribution of the vortices to the energy and pressure densities is of unphysical, negative sign. The negative sign corresponds to the “negative number” of degrees of freedom, which are balanced by the rest of the plasma. The Σ_P -field, on the other hand, condenses in the vacuum and is tachyonic in this sense as well. Unfortunately, more detailed comparison is not possible, since in case of the vortices the sign is defined with respect to $T = 0$. In case of the 3d models such a

normalization is not possible since these models do not work and not defined at $T = 0$.

Note that in both cases (4d vortices and 3d Higgs fields) the colorless scalar field is not the only important ingredient of the theory. In case of the vortices this follows from measuring contribution to the equation of state from the “rest of plasma”. In case of the Σ_P -field, it is explicitly one of four Higgs fields strongly interacting with each other.

B. Limitations of the 3d picture

In both approaches, we do not expect that the 3d picture remains valid in the continuum limit of the lattice spacing going to zero, $a \rightarrow 0$ with $a \ll 1/T$.

In case of theories which start with the Polyakov line the subtle point is the ultraviolet divergence associated with the operator L . This is the self-energy linear divergence common to all the Wilson lines on the quantum level:

$$\langle L \rangle \sim \exp(-M(a) \cdot T), \quad M(a) \sim g^2/a,$$

where a is the lattice spacing. To avoid this divergence one does not allow to consider the limit $a \rightarrow 0$ or, in another language, one considers smearing (“coarsening”) of Polyakov line over transverse finite distances of order $1/T$. In particular, Ref. [5] assumes the following coarsening:

$$L(x) \rightarrow \frac{1}{V_{\text{block}}} \int d^3x U(x, y) L(y) U(y, x), \quad (18)$$

where the integration goes over the (somewhat arbitrary) $O(T^3)$ volume of the block and $U(x, y)$ is a Wilson line connecting the points x and y at constant time $\tau = 0$.

Necessity for such a smearing makes direct contact with the continuum limit $a \rightarrow 0$ difficult and introduces uncertainties in understanding dynamics of the Polyakov lines. To our mind, the assumption that the UV divergence is smeared out is equivalent to the hypothesis that there exist electric strings with *physical* tension $\sigma \sim \Lambda_{QCD}^2$ at $T = 0$. As it is common in quantum geometry, the physical tension is a result of cancellation between UV divergent (bare) action and entropy:

$$\sigma \cdot (\text{area}) \sim (\text{action}) - (\text{entropy}).$$

Both the action and entropy are of order $(\text{area})/a^2$, where the area corresponds to the worldsheet of the string in the Euclidean space-time.

In case of the geometrical picture, or magnetic defects some coarsening is also implied. To see this, consider again the vacuum expectation value $\langle \Sigma_M \rangle$. We discussed the lattice data which show that the density ρ_s is in physical units, see (10). However, in the continuum limit one has [17]:

$$\langle \Sigma_M \rangle^2 \sim \rho_s \cdot a, \quad (19)$$

where a is the lattice spacing. By sending $a \rightarrow 0$ naively we would get $\langle \Sigma_M \rangle = 0$. But this would be true if the Σ_M were a fundamental field of a genuine 3d theory. In case of an effective theory we may assume $a \sim T^{-1}$ so that the condensate is expressed in physical (not in the lattice) units.

At very short distances, or very small lattice spacings a we expect to see again the 4d percolation picture of the vortices. Indeed, observation of a percolating cluster implies *action-entropy balance* at short distances, for details see [15, 17]. The precise form of the balance depends on the number of dimensions. The vortices are 4d objects and at short distances one expects restoration of the 4d picture, with no infinite, percolating cluster in the 3d projection².

To summarize, the use of the 3d language for the Higgs fields is justified in the infrared regime: provided a finite lattice spacing, or the coarsening scale is introduced for the *spatial* dimensions³, $a \geq 1/T$. This is true both from the continuum- and lattice-theories perspective. A delicate point is that a priori it is not clear that this reservation can be indeed implemented because the time extension is also of order $\tau_{\max} \sim 1/T$. Success reported in Ref. [5] supports the hypothesis that numerically the scheme still works. In the lattice version of the magnetic component of the plasma the same conclusion could be in fact made on the basis of the data [20]. Indeed, the behavior $\rho_s \sim T^2$ was observed for a range of the lattice spacings, although at very small spatial lattice spacing a it is expected to break down. However, we expect that the description of the infrared long distance 3d physics in terms of the condensed (magnetic) scalar field(s) should be a useful tool for study of the nonperturbative properties of the high temperature phase.

C. Symmetries involved

The symmetry behind introducing the $\mathbb{Z}_2$ parity of the Σ_P field is the global $\mathbb{Z}_2$ invariance of the original Yang-Mills theory in the lattice formulation. Let us remind the reader definition of this symmetry. In the discretized, lattice formulation the plaquette action $S_{x,\mu\nu}$ is given in terms of unitary matrices $U_{x\mu}$:

$$S_{x,\mu\nu} \sim \text{Tr}(U_{x\mu} U_{x+\hat{\mu},\nu} U_{x+\hat{\nu},\mu}^\dagger U_{x\nu}^\dagger), \quad (20)$$

² In case of the vortices such a phenomenon has not been observed yet on the lattice. As we believe, this happens because one cannot perform lattice simulations with small enough lattice spacings. However, a similar phenomenon in case of the magnetic monopoles has been observed recently, M. D'Elia and A. D'Alessandro, private communication.

³ This relation can be fulfilled for the lattices with space-time asymmetric spacing. Such asymmetry may be achieved by utilizing different lattice couplings spatial and temporal directions.

where

$$U_{x\mu} \sim \exp\{ia\hat{A}_\mu(x)\}, \quad (21)$$

$\hat{A}_\mu(x)$ is the discretized vector potential and a is the lattice spacing. The continuum action arises by expanding the lattice matrices U in series of the lattice spacing,

$$U \approx \mathbb{1} + ia\hat{A}_\mu(x) + O(a^2). \quad (22)$$

The global symmetry in point is the change of the sign of all the matrices U which correspond to links in the time direction at a given time, $\tau = 0$. The lattice action is not changed since the signs of two matrices U are changed simultaneously.

Note that after the change of the sign the matrices U are close to the matrix $-\mathbb{1}$ while the standard continuum limit corresponds to the matrices U in the vicinity of the unit matrix, $+\mathbb{1}$. It is worth emphasizing that existence of the $\mathbb{Z}_2$ symmetry is not automatic for any discretization. In particular, there is no $\mathbb{Z}_2$ symmetry if the discretized potential $\hat{A}_\mu \equiv A_\mu^a t_a$ is written in terms of the matrices t_a in the adjoint representation of the gauge group rather than in the fundamental representation as we assumed above. The continuum-limit action remains however the same.

Since the $\mathbb{Z}_2$ global symmetry is a property of a particular regularization scheme, one would expect that thermodynamical properties do not depend on existence of the $\mathbb{Z}_2$ symmetry. On the other hand, the whole of the message of the Ref. [5] is that introduction of the $\mathbb{Z}_2$ parity is crucial to reproduce the thermodynamics of the original theory, that is the second order phase transition.

Now, in the geometrical language of the defects we do not introduce any $\mathbb{Z}_2$ parity but account for the fact that there exist magnetic degrees of freedom, or defects. Existence of such defects seems to be a generic feature of the Yang-Mills theories formulated in the continuum language. In particular, holographic formulations do imply existence of the magnetic defects. Reduction of the magnetic defects to a 3d scalar, Σ_M field is, again, a generic feature of these models [8].

V. CONCLUSIONS

We have argued that the lattice data provides strong evidence that in the deconfining phase the magnetic vortices reduce to their 3d projection and can be described as a color singlet 3d Higgs field, Σ_M which is condensed in the 3d vacuum. This picture holds in the “infrared regime” (provided that the *spatial* resolution of the measurements is not too fine, that is $a \geq 1/T$ at high temperatures). The observations agree with the dual models mentioned in the Introduction. Indeed strings (or D-branes) become tensionless in the deconfining phase only if they are wrapped around the periodic Euclidean time direction. This is the explanation in the language of the

dual models why our surfaces are aligned with the time direction. Moreover, reduction of the strings to 3d particles follows from T-duality.

There are strong similarities between the properties of the magnetic scalar field Σ_M which is introduced in this paper, and the 3d Higgs field Σ_P which was recently introduced for absolutely independent reasons, see [5]. This similarity supports validity of the both pictures in their gross features.

Despite of these similarities of their properties, the symmetries behind the emerging fields Σ_M and Σ_P are different. The reason for the introduction the field Σ_P is $\mathbb{Z}_2$ symmetry which is a property of a particular ultraviolet regularization of Yang-Mills theories. Appearance of the field Σ_M reflects the fact that generically there exist both electric and magnetic defects.

Generally speaking, one cannot rule out that the family of the 3d scalars includes both Σ_M and Σ_P . Indeed, these fields were introduced for very different reasons. The most economic version which identifies Σ_M and Σ_P seems more attractive since in this case the number of the scalars agrees with predictions of the dual model.

Finally, the magnetic component of the Yang-Mills [9, 10, 11, 12, 13] plasma gets a novel interpretation in terms

of the 3d field theoretic models. This interpretation may provide us with a great simplification of the treatment of the gluonic plasma compared to the strings in original four-dimensional theory which hosts the original image for the magnetic component of the plasma.

Acknowledgments

This work was supported by Grants-in-Aid for Scientific Research from “The Ministry of Education, Culture, Sports, Science and Technology of Japan” Nos. 17340080 and 20340055, by the STINT Institutional grant IG2004-2 025, by the grants RFBR 08-02-00661-a, DFG-RFBR 436 RUS, by a grant for scientific schools NSH-679.2008.2, by the Federal Program of the Russian Ministry of Industry, Science and Technology No. 40.052.1.1.1112 and by the Russian Federal Agency for Nuclear Power. V.I.Z appreciate his fruitful stays at Research Institute for Information Science and Education of Hiroshima University, Japan and at the Laboratoire de Mathématiques et Physique Théorique at Université François Rabelais, Tours, France.

-
- [1] D. E. Kharzeev, [arXiv:0902.2749 [hep-ph]]; M. Gyulassy and L. McLerran, Nucl. Phys. **A 750** (2005) 30, [arXiv:nucl-th/0405013]; E. V. Shuryak, Nucl. Phys. **A 750** (2005) 64, [arXiv:hep-ph/0405066].
 - [2] A. M. Polyakov, Phys. Lett. **B72** (1978) 477.
 - [3] A. Vuorinen, L.G. Yaffe, Phys. Rev. **D74** (2006) 025011, [arXiv:hep-ph/0604100].
 - [4] R. D. Pisarski, Prog. Theor. Phys. Suppl. **168** (2007) 276, [arXiv:hep-ph/0612191].
 - [5] Ph. de Forcrand, A. Kurkela, A. Vuorinen, Phys. Rev. **D77** (2008) 125014 [arXiv:0801.1566 [hep-ph]].
 - [6] O. Aharony, S. S. Gubser, J. M. Maldacena, H. Ooguri, Y. Oz, Phys. Rept. **323** (2000) 183 [arXiv:hep-th/9905111].
 - [7] T. Sakai, S. Sugimoto, Published in Prog. Theor. Phys. **113** (2005) 843 [arXiv:hep-th/0412141]; O. Aharony, J. Sonnenschein, S. Yankielowicz, Annals Phys. **322** (2007) 1420 [arXiv:hep-th/0604161];
 - [8] A. Gorsky, V. Zakharov, A. Zhitnitsky, arXiv:0902.1842 [hep-ph].
 - [9] M. N. Chernodub, V. I. Zakharov, Phys. Rev. Lett. **98** (2007) 082002, [arXiv:hep-ph/0611228].
 - [10] J. Liao, E. Shuryak, Phys. Rev. **C75** (2007) 054907, [arXiv:hep-ph/0611131]; Phys. Rev. Lett. **101** (2008) 162302 [arXiv:0804.0255 [hep-ph]].
 - [11] M.N. Chernodub, A. Nakamura, V.I. Zakharov, Phys. Rev. **D78** (2008) 074021, [arXiv:0807.5012 [hep-lat]].
 - [12] A. Gorsky, V.I. Zakharov, Phys. Rev. **D77** (2008) 045017, [arXiv:0707.1284 [hep-th]].
 - [13] A. Alessandro, M. D’Elia, Nucl. Phys. **B 799**, (2008) 241 [arXiv:0711.1266 [hep-lat]].
 - [14] V.I. Zakharov, Braz. J. Phys. **37**, 165 (2007) [arXiv:hep-ph/0612342].
 - [15] A.M. Polyakov, “Gauge Fields and Strings” (Harwood Academic Publishers, New York, 1987)
 - [16] J. Greensite, Prog. Part. Nucl. Phys. **51** (2003) 1 [arXiv:hep-lat/0301023].
 - [17] M.N. Chernodub, V.I. Zakharov, Nucl. Phys. **B669** (2003), [arXiv:hep-th/0211267]; V.G. Bornyakov, P.Yu. Boyko, M.I. Polikarpov, V.I. Zakharov, Nucl. Phys. **B672** (2003) 222 [arXiv:hep-lat/0305021].
 - [18] S. Hioki, S. Kitahara, S. Kiura, Y. Matsubara, O. Miyamura, S. Ohno, T. Suzuki, Phys. Lett. **B 272**, 326 (1991) [Erratum-ibid. **B 281**, 416 (1992)].
 - [19] Sh. Ejiri, Sh. I. Kitahara, Y. Matsubara, T. Suzuki, Phys. Lett. **B343** (1995) 304, [arXiv:hep-lat/9407022].
 - [20] M. N. Chernodub, M. I. Polikarpov, A. I. Veselov, M. A. Zubkov, Nucl. Phys. Proc. Suppl. **73** (1999) [arXiv:hep-lat/9809158]; R. Bertle, M. Faber, J. Greensite and S. Olejnik, JHEP **9903**, 019 (1999) [arXiv:hep-lat/9903023]; M. Engelhardt, K. Langfeld, H. Reinhardt, O. Tennert, Phys. Rev. **D 61** (2000) 054504, [arXiv:hep-lat/9904004]; J. Gattnar, K. Langfeld, A. Schafke, H. Reinhardt, Phys. Lett. **B489** (2000) 251 [arXiv:hep-lat/0005016].
 - [21] G. S. Bali, J. Fingberg, U. M. Heller, F. Karsch, K. Schilling, Phys. Rev. Lett. **71**, 3059 (1993) [arXiv:hep-lat/9306024].
 - [22] M.N. Chernodub, H. Verschelde, V.I. Zakharov, in preparation.
 - [23] G. ’t Hooft Nucl. Phys. **B138** (1978) 1.
 - [24] V.G. Bornyakov et al., Phys. Lett. **B537** (2002) 291 [arXiv:hep-lat/0103032].